

Please add new Claims 10, 11, and 12:

1 -- 10. An interchangeable table top arrangement according to Claim 1 wherein said insert is  
2 provided with an image formed on a top surface thereof.

1 11. An interchangeable table top arrangement according to Claim 5 wherein said at least one  
2 finger hole is located along an edge of said substrate.

1 12. An interchangeable table top arrangement according to Claim 5 wherein said at least one  
2 finger hole is located at a corner of said substrate. --

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1 to 9, as amended, together with new Claims 10, 11, and 12, remain in this application and are presented for reconsideration.

Page 5 of the specification is amended to correct a reference number and to include a brief discussion of what is clearly shown in the Drawing, so as to provide antecedent support for new claims 11 and 12.

Claim 1 and its dependent claims 2 to 12 are now believed to be in allowable condition.

Claim 1 and its dependent claims, as originally filed, were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being allegedly obvious and unpatentable over Gilbert in view of Moore (Yokeley being applied also, but only as to Claim 6). Gilbert was cited for allegedly teaching structure substantially as claimed including substrate [?] (Figures 3, 4, 8), frame (A, C), insert (F, G), structure to attach the insert [i.e., grooves along the insides that mate with edges of the inserts], where the Examiner asserts that the only difference is that attachment means is not Velcro and there is not a means extending through the substrate to facilitate removal. Moore is cited for allegedly teaching the use of using a hole through the substrate to facilitate removal of the insert (e.g., 44 as discusses in column 5).

Independent Claim 1 now recites specifically that there are means that extend through the